



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,765	04/30/2001	Akihiro Sanda	Q63763	9192

7590 11/09/2006
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

PRONE, JASON D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,765

Applicant(s)

SANDA ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Prone

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,15 and 16 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 17-26 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 6, 18, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potsch et al. (3,788,180) in view of Wingen (4,275,631). See Appendix A for examiner added reference numerals. Potsch et al. discloses the invention including a drum-shaped rotary blade (53), a disk shaped rotary blade (68), that the rotary blade has a cutting edge (Fig. 9), a first beveled surface facing the drum-shaped rotary blade and progressively spaced from the drum-shaped rotary blade toward the cutting edge (68'), a second beveled surface facing the work piece and progressively spaced from the cutting edge away from the work piece (200), a plurality of disk-shaped rotary blades (68), and wherein the disk-shaped rotary blade is one of a plurality of a disk-shaped rotary blades (Fig. 2).

However, Potsch et al. fail to disclose that the disk-shaped rotary blade has irregularities along a circumference of the blade, the irregularities have an irregularity quantity set to a value which ranges from 0.5µm to 5µm, the irregularities have one of saw-tooth shaped and undulating shape, the irregularity quantity being a distance from a bottom to a top of one of the irregularities, the drum-shaped rotary blade comprises a plurality of grooves, each of the plurality of disk-shaped rotary blades corresponding to

one of the plurality of grooves, and wherein the plurality of grooves are disposed on a surface of the drum-shaped rotary blade.

Wingen teaches that it is old and well known in the art of slitter blades that these blades have irregularities in an undulating shape (Column 4, lines 6-10). It is old and well known that irregularities come in extremely small sizes. Its old and well known to have the surface as smooth as possible making the irregularities as small as possible therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have made the irregularities within the claimed range. Wingen teaches that it is old and well known in the art of slitter blades the drum-shaped rotary blade comprises a plurality of grooves (14), each of the plurality of disk-shaped rotary blades corresponding to one of the plurality of grooves (Fig. 3), and wherein the plurality of grooves are disposed on a surface of the drum-shaped rotary blade (Fig. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Potsch et al. with irregularities, as taught by Wingen, to provide the desired smoothness of the cutting apparatus.

3. Claims 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potsch et al. in view of Braner et al. (3,727,503). See Appendix A for examiner added reference numerals. Potsch et al. discloses the same invention including a drum-shaped rotary blade (53), a disk shaped rotary blade (68), the rotary blade has a cutting edge (Fig. 9), a first beveled surface facing the drum-shaped rotary blade and progressively spaced from the drum-shaped rotary blade toward the cutting edge (68'), a second beveled surface facing the work piece and progressively spaced

Art Unit: 3724

from the cutting edge away from the work piece (200), the drum-shaped rotary blade is disposed on a drum shaft (Fig. 3), and the disk-shaped rotary blade is disposed on a disk shaft (Fig. 3).

However, Potsch et al. fail to disclose a means for transmitting driving force between the drum shaft and the disk shaft, the shaft and the disk shaft are operably connected to rotate in unison, and the means for transmitting a driving force comprises gears.

Braner et al. teaches that it is old and well known in the art of slitters to incorporate a drum shaft and a disk shaft that are operably connected to rotate in unison through gears (98). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Potsch et al. with gears connecting the drum and drive shafts, as taught by Braner et al., to allow for added cutting efficiency.

4. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potsch et al. in view of Braner et al. as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Wingen. Potsch et al. in view of Braner et al. fail to disclose the drum-shaped rotary blade comprises a plurality of grooves, each of the plurality of disk-shaped rotary blades corresponding to one of the plurality of grooves, and wherein the plurality of grooves are disposed on a surface of the drum-shaped rotary blade.

Wingen teaches that it is old and well known in the art of slitter blades the drum-shaped rotary blade comprises a plurality of grooves (14), each of the plurality of disk-shaped rotary blades corresponding to one of the plurality of grooves (Fig. 3), and

Art Unit: 3724

wherein the plurality of grooves are disposed on a surface of the drum-shaped rotary blade (Fig. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Potsch et al. in view of Braner et al. with the drum shaped rotary blade structure, as taught by Wingen, to produce burr free work pieces.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6 and 17-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 15, and 16 are allowed.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fairfield, Jr. et al., Van Cleave, Fremion, Dutina, Tidland et al., and Lee et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is (571) 272-4513. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-4:30, Mon - (every other) Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

November 06, 2006



Patent Examiner

Jason Prone

Art Unit 3724

T.C. 3700